

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Attorney Docket No. 13940US02 (BU 2546.1)

In the Application of:

Scott S. McDaniel

U.S. Serial No.: 10/643,331

Filed: August 19, 2003

For: A SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR
TRANSFERRING DATA OVER A
REMOTE DIRECT MEMORY
ACCESS (RDMA) NETWORK

Examiner: BELANI, KISHIN G

Group Art Unit: 2443

Conf. No.: 3987

Customer No.: 23446

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
transmitted via EFS-Web to the United States
Patent and Trademark Office on July 1, 2010.

/Philip Henry Sheridan/

Philip Henry Sheridan
Reg. No. 59,918

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Please enter this Interview Summary in the record to the above case.

(1) All Participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Examiner Kishin G. Belani
- (2) Philip H. Sheridan, Attorney of Record

(2) Date of Interview: May 26, 2010

Type – Telephonic

(3) Substance of Interview:

On May 26, 2010, Examiner Kishin G. Belani and the Applicant's representative (Philip H. Sheridan) discussed the finally rejected independent claims 1, 17, 24 and 25. The Applicant's representative notes that the Interview Summary mailed by the Examiner indicates that the interview took place on May 25, 2010. The Applicant's representative respectfully reminds the Examiner that although the interview was originally scheduled for Tuesday, May 25, 2010, the Examiner requested that the interview be pushed back to Wednesday, May 26, 2010, after the Applicant called to conduct the interview.

With regard to independent claims 1 and 24, the Applicant's representative explained to the Examiner how prior art RDMA processes are initiated as disclosed in the background of the invention section and prior art Figure 3 of the current application. Next, the Applicant's representative explained how the prior art method for initiating an RDMA process differs from the method in the claims and as disclosed in the detailed description of the invention section and Figure 4 of the current application. Then, the Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the Osborne reference. The Applicant's representative noted that an initiation process is not specifically disclosed in Osborne. The Examiner argued that an initiation process must occur and does not explicitly need to be disclosed because it is obvious (despite the rejection of independent claim 1 being under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)). Further, the Examiner argued that he interprets the send command sent from an application to an operating system to be the initiation process. In response, the Applicant's representative noted that a send command sent between an application and an operating system fails to teach a single command message **sent between the driver and the NIC**, wherein the single command message comprises buffer command information, and a write command to write a send command. Additionally, the Applicant's representative noted that although an initiation process may occur in Osborne, the reference itself does not disclose the details of the initiation process and thus cannot disclose the Applicant's

Serial No. 10/643,331
Summary of May 26, 2010 Interview
Interview Summary dated July 1, 2010

initiation process set forth in independent claims 1 and 24. The Examiner maintained that the Osborne reference was sufficient in disclosing the claim limitations.

With regard to independent claims 17 and 25, the Examiner acknowledged that the cited references failed to teach a single completion message sent between the driver and the NIC of the host comprising buffer freeing status information. Rather, the Examiner acknowledged that the sections of the Pandya reference cited by the Examiner merely disclose a message indicating the data transfer is complete is sent from the target to the initiator and that the completion message is passed up to the iSCSI layer where the message is processed and the buffers being used are released. However, the Examiner indicated that a NIC would not pass buffer freeing status information to the driver with the send complete indication (as recited in independent claims 17 and 25) because the NIC cannot free buffers. In other words, despite acknowledging that the cited references failed to teach the claim limitations, the Examiner argued that the claims were not allowable because they were inoperable.

No agreement was reached between the Examiner and the Applicant's representative.

Date: July 1, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip Henry Sheridan/
Philip Henry Sheridan
Reg. No. 59,918
Attorney for Applicant

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
(T) 312 775 8000
(F) 312 775 8100